

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

May 18, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 21-60231  
Summary Calendar

---

EMILIA ELIZABETH FLORES-ABREGO,

*Petitioner,*

*versus*

MERRICK GARLAND, *U.S. Attorney General,*

*Respondent.*

---

Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals  
BIA No. A209 898 536

---

Before KING, COSTA, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Emilia Elizabeth Flores-Abrego petitions for review of a decision by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing her appeal from the denial of her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). With respect to her claims for

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 21-60231

asylum and withholding of removal, the BIA concluded that there was no clear error in a finding by the immigration judge that the record contained no evidence that Flores-Abrego was targeted because of any actual or imputed political opinion, which was the basis of her claims. While suggesting to this court that she fears harm on account of her political belief that the government and some police officers in Honduras corruptly ignore or cooperate with criminal gangs, she cites no evidence that she has or will be harmed because she holds that opinion. Flores-Abrego thus fails to show that the evidence compels a finding of persecution “motivated, at least in part, by a political opinion held by her or imputed to her.” *Thuri v. Ashcroft*, 380 F.3d 788, 792 (5th Cir. 2004). Because the nexus issue is dispositive of her asylum and withholding of removal claims, *see Orellana-Monson v. Holder*, 685 F.3d 511, 518 (5th Cir. 2012), we do not consider whether she showed harm constituting persecution or an unwillingness or inability of the Honduran government to protect her, *see INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976); *Cantu-Delgadillo v. Holder*, 584 F.3d 682, 690 (5th Cir. 2009).

Similarly, Flores-Abrego does not cite any evidence to contradict the BIA’s conclusion that she failed to establish the state action required to obtain relief under the CAT. *See Tabora Gutierrez v. Garland*, 12 F.4th 496, 502-03 (5th Cir. 2021). While she vaguely asserts that she will suffer repercussions if she files a report with “an acquiescent police department” and that the government of Honduras turns a blind eye to criminal gangs and cooperates with them, she fails to show that the evidence compels a conclusion contrary to the BIA’s. *See id.* at 504.

Accordingly, the petition for review is DENIED.